

Process – Concurrent with Testing

1. February Training Evaluation
2. Bias Review Summary
3. Minutes from Meetings
4. Access Problems Noted in Emails and
Individual Summary Reports

Workshop Evaluation

This evaluation form is intended to measure your reactions to this instructor and workshop. It will provide important feedback for improvement. Your responses are important, and will be read.

Exceptionally Good=A...Good=B...Average=C...Below Average=D...Unsatisfactory=E/F

RATE THE INSTRUCTOR BY SELECTING THE BEST RESPONSE FOR EACH STATEMENT: **X IN BOX**

1. PREPARATION –Preparation for workshop	A	B	C	D	E/F
2. Organization of workshop content					
3. RAPPORT – Rapport with teachers					
4. Response to comments and questions					
5. EFFORT – Encouragement of effort					
6. CONTRIBUTION – Intellectual stimulation					
7. Material not easily gained from other sources					
8. RELEVANCE – Examples and illustrations					
9. Proficiencies contributed to learning and understanding of subject					
10. EVALUATION – Evaluation of proficiencies					
11. Quality of feedback provided					
12. KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS – Knowledge of content					
13. Ability to communicate knowledge of content					
14. OVERALL – Overall teaching of the workshop					

Comments:

Descriptive Statistics from February 23-24 2006 Workshop

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Preparation	23	0	4	3.70	.876
Organization	25	2	4	3.60	.707
Rapport	25	3	4	3.84	.374
Response	25	3	4	3.84	.374
Effort	25	3	4	3.84	.374
Contribution	25	2	4	3.72	.542
Material Access	23	2	4	3.83	.491
Relevance	25	2	4	3.72	.542
Proficiency	25	2	4	3.60	.577
Evaluation	22	2	4	3.64	.658
Feedback	24	2	4	3.67	.565
Knowledge/Skill	25	3	4	3.96	.200
Communicate	25	2	4	3.84	.473
Overall	25	3	4	3.88	.332

Frequency Tables from February 23-24 2006 Workshop

Preparation

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	4.0	4.3
	3	3	12.0	17.4
	4	19	76.0	100.0
Total	23	92.0	100.0	
Missing System	2	8.0		
Total	25	100.0		

Organization

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	3	12.0	12.0
	3	4	16.0	28.0
	4	18	72.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	100.0	

Rapport

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3	4	16.0	16.0
	4	21	84.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	100.0	

Response

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3	4	16.0	16.0
	4	21	84.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	100.0	

Effort

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3	4	16.0	16.0
	4	21	84.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	100.0	

Contribution

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	1	4.0	4.0	4.0
	3	5	20.0	20.0	24.0
	4	19	76.0	76.0	100.0
Total		25	100.0	100.0	

Material Access

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	1	4.0	4.3	4.3
	3	2	8.0	8.7	13.0
	4	20	80.0	87.0	100.0
Total		23	92.0	100.0	
Missing	System	2	8.0		
Total		25	100.0		

Relevance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	1	4.0	4.0	4.0
	3	5	20.0	20.0	24.0
	4	19	76.0	76.0	100.0
Total		25	100.0	100.0	

Proficiency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	1	4.0	4.0	4.0
	3	8	32.0	32.0	36.0
	4	16	64.0	64.0	100.0
Total		25	100.0	100.0	

Evaluation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	2	8.0	9.1	9.1
	3	4	16.0	18.2	27.3
	4	16	64.0	72.7	100.0
Total		22	88.0	100.0	
Missing	System	3	12.0		
Total		25	100.0		

Feedback

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	1	4.0	4.2	4.2
	3	6	24.0	25.0	29.2
	4	17	68.0	70.8	100.0
Total		24	96.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.0		
Total		25	100.0		

Knowledge/Skill

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3	1	4.0	4.0	4.0
	4	24	96.0	96.0	100.0
Total		25	100.0	100.0	

Communicate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	1	4.0	4.0	4.0
	3	2	8.0	8.0	12.0
	4	22	88.0	88.0	100.0
Total		25	100.0	100.0	

Overall

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3	3	12.0	12.0	12.0
	4	22	88.0	88.0	100.0
Total		25	100.0	100.0	

Due to my learning style, the discussion/presentation was too fragmented. I would have benefited more by one day of whole group discussion and one day working individually on computer with frequent breaks for questions.

For this eval: need to have 4 point rubric!

Where's the Rubric?

Thanks

I enjoyed the presenter.

From the point of the start of the session it was fine. Maybe not concrete-sequential but fine. The problem was in the organization leading up to the training. The fact there was no transportation allowed for reimbursement to the training is absurd. Either have the training in a hotel or provide transportation. The hotel that agreed to provide a shuttle was organized after several of us had already made reservations. Also, the fact that the meeting was starting at noon was not passed on until way late in the game. We had already gotten our flights scheduled for the night before and could have waited to fly in. It would have saved the state lots of money even to the point they could have provided the transportation for everyone. Communication prior to training could have been much better.

In regards to the planning and notification of the conference I was disappointed to be not notified in a timely manner of the actual schedule (2-1/2 days). This interfered with airplane reservations and other considerations. I did not find out the schedule until at the hotel.

Nice job staying cool during pressure! Good answering of questions and redirection of "vents".

Much Improved – Good sense of humor, extremely knowledgeable.

Overwhelming!

Thank you so much!

Thank you! I'm sure my team will be very pleased.

This is great progress in assessment for students with low cognition. Is another alternate assessment pilot in progress for students who have average or above average cognition but with severe learning disability; ie. – 3rd grader who cannot hold/process symbols (numbers and letters)?

It would be nice to have this all standardized from state to state, so that when we and/or students move, testing, etc., would be valid and understood.

Materials	Issue	Resolution	Page
All	Font off ...	Times	Pub Page
W_SP	Tasks	Added <i>Identify</i> and <i>Stamp</i>	1
W_SP	Codes	Added <i>ACCOM</i>	2
W_SP	Directions	Changed after three seconds to <i>after a delay with</i>	3,4,5,8,10
W_SP	Comments	Added <i>comment about upper and lower cases</i>	3, 4, 5, 6,
W_SP	Tasks	Added <i>Identify/Copy</i>	3,4,5
W_SP	Comments	Added <i>words may be signed</i>	7,8,
W_SP	Comments	Added <i>two sentences may be created...</i>	9
W_SP	Directions	Added <i>point to each word & then you'll sign it</i>	11
W_SP	Directions	Changed 3 minutes to 10 and 2.5 to 7	12
R_SP	Tasks	Added <i>Representations of Objects</i> to number 1	1,2,3
R_SP	Skills List	Added <i>Reach, Push Away, Attach Symbol</i>	2
R_SP	Codes	Added <i>ACCOM</i>	2
R_SP	Directions	Changed after three seconds to <i>after a delay with</i>	all
R_SP	Scoring	Changed fire alarm sign to <i>information sign</i>	4
R_SP	Scoring	Changed wrong way sign to <i>food/dining/restaurant</i>	4
R_SP	Directions	Changed story Sally Smith to <i>Jim's Coins</i>	6 and 7
R_SP	Directions	Added <i>have a significant language problem</i>	8,9,10,11
R_SP	Comments	Added <i>words can be changed...or presented in Braille</i>	11,12,
R_SP	Directions	Changed ALL to <i>EACH</i>	11
R_SP	Scoring	Changed yell to <i>trip</i> , cake to <i>meal</i> , cars to <i>Jim drove</i>	14
R_SP	Added	<i>*For students reading with large print, Braille, etc.</i>	17
R_SP	Example	Changed wording to <i>-all over the place, dog catcher</i>	22
R_SP	Scoring	Changed pound to <i>dog catcher, silly to pest</i>	23
R_SP	Example	Changed homework log to <i>homework notebook</i>	24,25
R_SM	Signs	Changed fire alarm to <i>information-wrong way to dining</i>	2
R_SM	Sentences	Changed yell to <i>trip</i> , cake to <i>meal</i> , cars to <i>Jim drove</i>	8
R_SM	Text	Changed wording to <i>-all over the place, dog catcher</i>	12
R_SM	Text	Changed homework log to <i>homework notebook</i>	13
M_SP	Tasks	Added <i>Identify/Copy</i>	1,2,4
M_SP	Directions	Changed after three seconds to <i>after a delay with</i>	all
M_SP	Skills List	Added <i>Reach, Push Away, Attach Symbol</i>	2
M_SP	Comments	Added <i>numbers can not be rotated vertically...</i>	4,6
M_SP	Directions	Re-aligned scoring protocol	6
M_SP	Directions	Switched Item 2 and 4 in <i>Directions and Scoring</i>	7
M_SP	Scoring	Changed the <i>shapes to squares and rectangles</i>	8
M_SP	Directions	Changed wording of <i>day and year</i>	10
M_SP	Example	Changed <i>pictures in the examples</i>	10
M_SP	Bus	<i>Took out the bus</i>	15
M_SP	Scoring	Added <i>immediately to #2, of the week to #4</i>	16
M_SP	Directions	Removed <i>character after Cuisenaire</i>	22
M_SP	Example	Removed <i>O character in number sequence</i>	23
M_SM	Task 6	Changed <i>shapes</i>	8
M_SM	Task 8	Changed <i>pictures in the items - 1 and 3</i>	10
M_SM	Task 12	Removed <i>the bus</i>	9

Key

W=Writing

R=Reading

M=Math

SP=Scoring Protocol

SM=Student Materials

Collected Minutes from Conference Calls

Dec 13, 2005

Dec. 28, 2005

Jan. 10, 2006

Jan. 24, 2006

Feb. 14, 2006

Feb. 28, 2006

Mar. 14, 2006

Mar. 27, 2006

Apr. 11, 2006

Apr. 25, 2006

May 9, 2006

May 23, 2006 – Meeting at ASES in Little Rock

June 11, 2006

June 26, 2006 – Meeting at Large-Scale in San Francisco

Conference Call – December 13, 2005 at 3:30 (AST), 4:30 (PST), and 7:30 (EST)

Present: Chris Letterman, Pat Almond, Aran Felix, Cecelia (?), Aaron Glasgow, and Jerry Tindal

Reviewed the URL in KY sent by Chris for DRA to test the server: Connectivity from districts to web server may be influenced by more than the location of the web server. Issue of whether that is the best starting place, though we may need to eventually consider this.

- Current issue: At present, the URL (<http://brtgroup.org/exrwms/>) used for the assessment training and data entry has not been tested by EED; this would be a better starting point.

Clarification: The web site is NOT a testing environment (rather teachers actually download the test and then give the test to students directly). The URL provides training and data entry only.

Critical question is: Does our site work from the user's end?

Also, need to clarify three layers of a problem

1. End user knowledge and skill – Any problems here need to be resolved by DRA in the training and support systems that are provided (technical manuals, direct training, training materials, 800 number).
2. Local system capacity – Problems in this arena need to be shared by the local district (e.g. Ed Tech Director) and DRA (e.g., if the system is of such low quality, then DRA provides a paper-pencil solution).
3. The server and Internet Service Provider (ISP) – Problems that occur here need to be resolved by EdPRogress.

History: Previous problems occurred with IEP system because of a lack of bandwidth; by moving the server, the problem was resolved the problem. It is important to learn a lesson from this problem: Was this move successful because of reducing the distance to AK or because of a shift to a better tiered service provider. Remote sites (e.g., Bering Straits) and Anchorage (because it has high traffic) need to test the site.

Immediate Proposal: We decided that the end user survey of tech office would at least begin testing the current site; if teachers are available, they also could participate. This review is designed only to test connectivity (and not take a lot of time). The review would be initiated by DRA with a survey and sent to Aran Felix; EED staff would send this survey on to end users who would directly give feedback to Jerry Tindal (which would be compiled and sent to EED staff).

Long Term Proposal: The servers from Ed Progress will include a number of features currently not present in the one being tested and include dual processor, Mac G5, 2g RAM; a web site will be used to allow end user's to test their local computer connection. Also, three servers will be used: 1 that is live, 1 serving as a back up, and 1 for development (which will be accessible to EED to check on and electronically provide feedback).

Questions and Issues for the Conference Call on AK Alternate Assessment – Dec. 28, 2006

Attendance: Pat Almond, Les Moore, Aran Felix, Jerry Tindal

Aran: following are a number of loose odds and ends that we need to address in the launch conference call. Please feel free to edit, add, or delete.

1. *Should we be aligning the tasks from the existing alternate assessment to the Colorado Expanded Standards or to the AK 'Performance' Standards?*

Need to develop a test specifications to identify what content needs to be included. The performance descriptors include both content and achievement.

GLEs, Extended (generic) GLEs, or Performance Descriptors? Content people were in the groups.

Show that the AA is (linked) to grade level expectations. What is the content of the GLE and extend it so it can be accomplished by this population.

Use performance descriptors and cross walk with the test.

Train in 2006 (with mentor teachers)-implement statewide in 2007

Develop new tasks in 2006-pilot in 2007-implement statewide in 2008

At AK conference Aran will present; a pilot will be done; fall training will occur.

Take CO consensus frameworks and align with AK

Michelle took tasks with grade level expectations

Content can be clustered across grade level and achievement is at grade level

What is the timeline for completion?

We plan to cross walk AA in OR with AA performance descriptors

2. *When should we schedule the following events:*
 - a. Crosswalk in Feb 2006; Alignment in Feb 2007
 - b. Training – Aran shows the system at AK conference; face to face training on Feb. 23-24 (22 teachers signed up from last fall or 8-10 per subject area)
 - c. Bias review of existing items with a small group of teachers on PM Feb. 24
 - d. Conduct pilot administration in mid April-May
 - e. Mock up of standard setting (presented to TAC meeting on May 3-4 and Oct. 25-26) – Send proposal to them by April 26th.
 - f. Mentor training on Sept. 11-12 or 12-13.
3. *Should we add tasks to any of the current assessments to ensure better coverage of the standards? If so, when should we roll them out?*

4. *Update from the survey of 'access' to current web site (report to follow)*

Report to be completed by JT in the next couple of weeks

Survey to be re-sent by Aran when schools start after winter break

5. *How should teachers be contacted and by who (we need to decide a line of command and distinction between DRA working for the client (AK) and setting policy not a responsibility of DRA).*

Request for REA (Request for EED approval) between DRA and EED; form to be completed that is denied, accepted, or adjusted.

Double check with support staff to get up to date list (see Kari for updated list of mentors, ~~SPED directors [Penny Cook], District Test Coordinators~~)

6. *Notes from weekly meeting with Pat and JT*

- a. We both have questions about the expanded benchmarks: how are they to be reviewed?
- b. Any assessment that is used for training this year (in either Feb. or April, which?) needs to be what is delivered next year in 2007.
- c. Any new tasks we develop need to be implemented with the grade group assessments: why grades 3-4, 5-6, 7-8, 9-10 instead of elementary (3-4-5), middle (6-7-8), and high (9-10)? When do we make this shift (I assume in 2008 with task development proceeding this year and bias review and alignment taking place next year in 2007)?

7. *What are 'field operations' for Pat and how can we ensure both efficient and effective communication and support?*

8. *How would you like the monthly reports considered (topics, formats, distribution?)*

Need to reschedule a meeting on the expanded benchmarks with materials in hand

Conference calls every 2nd and 4th Tuesday of the month at 9:30 AK (10:30 PST)

Jan. 10th and 24th

Feb. 14th and 28th

March 14th and 28th

April 11th and 25th

May 9th and 23rd

June 13th and 27th

To do:

Aran will send JT the REA and the mentor list

Pat will send the expanded benchmarks

Agenda: Conference Call for Alaska Alternate Assessment – January 10, 2006

Attendance: Les Morse, Jeanne Foy, Aran Felix, Jerry Tindal, Patricia Almond

Update on technology access (see draft of technical report)

Most problems are human

JT will compile new responses and update the report

Create a more explicit user manual

Aran will send names of individuals who were sent the survey

Crosswalk of Extended Assessment

Grade Level Expectations

Extended Grade Level Expectations

Michelle used the expanded CO standards.

Draft performance descriptors are universal; Jeanne and Aran are coding the GLEs in the grade level. Groups placed the descriptors in grade levels; in November with a smaller group with content and sped teachers went with grade clusters (for draft performance descriptors); entry points are universal. Achievement standards are by grade level clusters (separating them was not useful). In standard setting, we can look at differences by grade level. This week the extended GLEs will be done. Place the entry to regular GLE for all grades not just 9th grade. A key will be developed like page 43 of standards handbook.

Alternate Assessment for 05-06: Pat's diagram needs grade levels changed to 3-4, 5-6, 7-8, 9-10. Designed to reflect parallel development of AA and regular test; for 2005-2006, we plan to pilot existing assessments and link the AA (as is) with the GLEs (as developed); also will conduct standard setting to explicate a model/process; in 2006-2007, we are piloting new items; in 2007-2008 the AA will be entirely grade group defined with new items that have been successfully field-tested the previous year and standard setting conducted on them.

The current AA is wide range; need to analyze the test blueprint and link to the extended GLE. AK will code GLEs with no items (note that it is under development).

Performance descriptors: Review them so the format that is optimal for standard setting; call them proficiency descriptors (help standard setting folks orient to grade levels); suggest taking them to naïve folks to determine if they communicate. Make them look and feel the same as those used with the general assessment.

Update on technology infrastructure

800 number to be ready within a week; will send out for internal pilot

Conference call number will change; will send out for next call

Email contact: Currently, the problem seems mostly from the UO; JT will distribute his private email address.

Server development – 3 servers are deployed: (a) live, (b) back-up, and (c) development

February Meetings

Dates – Feb 23 (1-4) and 24 (8-12) in Anchorage for training with 25 teachers in a computer lab; also meeting during ASES in mid morning on Tuesday.

Bias Review – Feb. 24 (1-5); materials will be sent for review by the end of January

Pilot Training – 25 teachers in a computer room

Dates and times for future conference calls: Moved only one date: Jan. 24 (TBA for an afternoon call).

Other issues

Conference Call – DRA and EED – January 24, 2006

Attendance: Aran Felix, Pat Almond, Jerry Tindal

Who to Send Notices?

Nancy Guthrie – In special education; Aran will send us her address.

Extended Grade Level Expectations (Standards)

Cross Walk Ex-GLE with Extended Assessments (Michelle)

Michelle is using the color-coding (red=missing, blue=needs adjustment, green=complete).

Objectives that were identified in the blueprint document may not need to be developed (or may be pushed into the local assessment); they may make the AA too long.

Purpose in Context of Next Steps

Get them into the hands of teachers in Feb 16th and 21st (also mail them) and present at the training (Feb 23rd -24th) as well as get them on the web site. The purpose is to forewarn teachers on what they will be assessed on.

Will teachers become too literal in how they use them? Will they use in the IEP to focus their instruction? A stated purpose may alleviate this problem (e.g., looking for feedback?).

What will be tested? What is proficient?

Least to most complex structure used

‘T’ indicates a test item (cross walked with the GLEs) – see science for cross walk standards and strands.

Currently is version 1 – To serve as a guide for instruction, not a curriculum; how does it work with an IEP?

What are access skills; need to consider method of communication and response method.

Performance Descriptors – Format and Content

Plan to pull out of bullet format and make connected text.

Place in the booklet (the standards may change).

Give an idea of what a child looks like at each proficiency level.

Tendency to make them an outline of GLEs.

For regular assessment, the descriptors reflect much of the content (not everything will be assessed).

Confusion of putting standards content in the IEP or not.

With the portfolio, the ‘essentialized’ standard went into the IEP (but it took over the IEP).

Will be modified by mentors.

Train in Jan (Feb.), test in March (1st) to April (7th), impact data in April, standard setting in May, train in Sept, follow-up in Oct.

Test window would be 5 weeks (with 1 week for late entry)

Update on Draft of Technology Access Report

A total of 11 respondents; draft 2 sent to AK in mid-January (20th), 2006

Visit on Feb. 23-24

Bias Review

- Use of contractions in Braille and with sign language
- Simplified language in directions
- Response demands
- Content review
- Value in the community (context in using functional skills)
- Access versus target skills
- Accommodations allowed (versus modifications)
- Not administered–Inappropriate (NA-I) and Not administered-Proficient (NA-P)
- Race-ethnicity bias
- Gender bias
- Cultural bias
- Language bias

Training on Feb. 23-24 (see Pat's Organizer on the next page)

- Mentor training on Sept. 11-12 (JT and Pat to be present)
- GLEs, Extended GLEs, IEPs (see Fran), new test
- Check administrator training page

Update on Science Assessments (Web site and Technical Report)

New Extended Assessments (see Pat's agenda on the next page)

- Test window
- Format of tasks-items
- Training on administration and scoring
- Proficiency examinations
- Mentor assessors
- Data entry
- On your own completion (and presentation of technology access and supports)

Alaska Alternate Assessment 2005-2006
Anchorage Pilot Training
Extended Assessments in Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science

Objectives:

- Review spring 2006 timelines, activities, expectations
- Introduce pilot teachers to the extended assessments: subjects, tasks within subjects, items within tasks, accuracy and partially correct scoring
- Provide demonstrations and practice sessions on administering selected tasks
- Introduce pilot teachers to the online training system, e.g. How to log on, navigate training system, and assess progress
- Describe qualifying system and have teachers identify students to assess for pilot and subjects to assess

Thursday, February 23, 2006

1:00 to 5:00 p.m.

Location Computer Lab

- Introduce Pilot Training: purpose, timelines, activities, expectations—Aran
- Provide overview of Extended Assessments—PowerPoint w/ Video—Jerry
- Provide hands on practice with administering a simple task, e.g. ID signs—Jerry
- Provide hands on practice with administering more complex task, e.g. read aloud comprehension—JT
- Provide orientation to navigating on-line training system—JT

Friday, February 24, 2006

8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Location Computer Lab

- Review activities from Thursday afternoon
- Divide into groups by subject and have teachers walk through entire assessment to become familiar with tasks and range of complexity
-

Lime Lab for Thurs/Fri 2/23 and 2/24/06 all day. I'm going to use the rooms half the time. On Friday afternoon, I need a room for about 10 people to meet. Is there something nearby? I thought I heard you mention a Blue Room? Thanks, Aran Felix, Dept of Education/Assessment Unit

Agenda for Alaska Alternate Assessment Conference Call – Feb 14, 2006

Attendance: Aran Felix, Nancy Guthrie, Les Morse, Pat Almond, Jerry Tindal

Annual plan and detailed plan for three-year sets

Three major components

Cycle of operation

Meetings with teachers

See documents from Pat that address operations, test development, and technical adequacy.

Fixes in the spring need to be immediate.

Use the Short and Long Term Plan monthly.

The plan can be used for peer review submission in May (need to show detailed timeline through 08 and 09 to include science and technical manuals).

Include Mentor training in Anchorage on Sept. 11-12 (or 12-13).

Five things needed for the AA: Sue Rigney's list includes...

Update on technology infrastructure

Servers –

Web site

Scoring and reporting

Three servers are configured and will be used for implementation, development, and backup.

The web site will be ak.k12test.com. The scoring and reporting system is just being completed this week. Send Aran an example report from Oregon if the AK report is not ready.

Training on Feb 23 and 24

Agenda

Qualified Assessors

1 credit of UO

Aran will introduce the new; conduct a survey of the workshop; request if teachers would be willing to meet in a focus group (in May); include extended GLEs

If they take 1 credit in Feb, they need to assess in all three areas and send in their protocols to DRA for clearance

In the fall, they will be trained and become QA in Sept. (meet again at the end of Oct)

Bias Review meeting on Feb 24

Five (deaf, blind, 2 teachers, and 1 parent)

Discussion on arrangements to be made from DRA

Materials can be shipped to Residence Inn (1 week in advance with DHL)

Agenda for Alaska Alternate Assessment Conference Call – Feb 28, 2006

Attendance: Les Morse, Aran Felix, Josh Geller, Jerry Tindal

Review of training on Feb 23-24

Technology: Two tries on logging in:

Content: Very positive reactions

Proficiencies: Reviewed follow-up

Next steps for teachers in training

Proficiencies

Practice

Pilot

Review of bias review

Mild cultural bias

Important dates and events

Web materials on March 13 become available for the pilot

Final submission of everything is May 1

- *Scoring protocols in reading, writing, and mathematics*
- *Evaluation Survey*

Other

Conference Call – Alaska Alternate Assessment – March 14, 2006

Attendance: Aran Felix, Pat Almond, Jerry Tindal

Update on Implementation

Training Proficiency – The Rest of the Story

Change cover dates to May 1.

March 13 can down load.

April 31 (change to April 30) and mail everything.

Proficiency is to be done by May 1 (change it to April 15).

Update folks with their proficiency and send out with a 2-week reminder; revised checklist should be attached with notice of who is proficiency. Changes in addresses need to be made by (March 20).

JT will send out a prompt that they will introduce Pat and Sevrina; they will be receiving follow-up from Pat and eventually from Sevrina. Use Subject header “DRA–Pilot test follow-up”

Qualified Assessor Status – Materials Distribution

Materials Update – Good to Go (March 13-April 7): Dates March 13-April 28

Scoring and Data Entry – Data Wipe

Update on Servers:

Aaron and JT are looking at the servers; they have noted the server in Seattle is slower than the one in Oregon. We plan to change servers next year but it might be just as well to keep everything as is for now (as it would take too long to switch and the testing window would be closed by the time it is accomplished). Next year, we will change servers to a more expensive one that can handle more traffic. Pat will craft the initial letter and Aran will follow up.

FAQ

Changes that are Policy: Aran will change font to yellow

Changes that are DRA: JT will change the font to blue

Participation Guidelines

<http://www.eed.state.ak.us/tls/assessment/AlternateOptional/05-06/ExpandedFormatPartCriteriaAug05.pdf>

http://www.eed.state.ak.us/tls/assessment/participation_guidelines/ParticipationGuidelinesJune2005Final.pdf

Pat will review from a state perspective by March 24

External Evaluation - National TAC and AK Assessment Advisory group

May be too early

Time intervals:

Annual?

WA: An agenda item for the TAC every time they met.

What needs to go to the AK TAC on May 3?

Description of new test and its implementation levels

What it is and what it will be?

Standard setting plan

The one item they are expecting

Reports to be completed

Standard setting plan

Connectivity report – Done

Bias review report – In process

Alignment phase I (GLE and Extended Assessment)

Timelines

DRA presence at TAC: Morning of May 3; will arrange audio or video

June/July launch in Juneau

Meghan will look at calendars for Les, Commissioner, Special Education

Oregon PR letter

It appears material was missing for the extended assessment.

Update on Timelines – Pat and Aran

Other

Conference Call – March 27, 2006

Attendance: Aran, Les, JT

National TAC and Mentors can serve as advisors to provide feedback

TAC Meeting on May 3

APRIL 20 materials due

JT on for 2 hours

Documents Needed

Alignment Process

Bias Review (not to present but have available)

Standard Setting

Launch and Kick Off New Assessments (help the mentors get started)

September 6 is overview in Juneau

September 7 is training in Juneau

September 8 is in Fairbanks

Sept. 11-15 to train mentors (Anchorage, regional, mentors for 3 days) – April is when Anchorage schedules the labs.

Training Proficiencies

Aran took all the proficiencies

Tasks 14-15 took a while to load up

Administration clips need to change answer and add explanation

Took 2 hours for reading and writing; 3 hours for math

Forced to go through VERY carefully

Modified administration were good

Mentors to break into 2 days (training and lab so it switches)

Add the CLS and CWS to training manual

District Test Coordinators (modified overview) and Mentors

Test Security

Chain of command

FAQ needed to sort that which is policy from that which is training

Who pays for toner, paper, etc.

Send to district test coordinators: Test administration manual, scoring protocols, and participation guidelines

Usually send test administration manuals but not practice tests

Need transitional period with surface mailing (next year or two?)

Need to send mentors rules of the road (how to become a qualified assessor, materials release, web site (via memo?))

Gave the password to Meghan (who is not proficient but could open the test)

Proposal: After gaining proficiency, testers have their email and password transferred to a DB that is used to screen permission to obtain access to the secure test. Still require practice and submission of the protocol to Mentors.

For HS exit exam, Proctors are used; otherwise, everyone can administer the test; can have paraprofessionals administer it.

District to associate (building level) – Mentors to do the same by following the same rules as used in the general education testing

Need a flow chart for decision-making and training

Need to use a refresher (but may not need every component) – review the proficiency and develop a bridge manual

For students who are extremely low, teachers need to become proficient in ALL tasks

Aran will be working with teachers observing administration in elementary and high schools (perhaps middle school also)

To Do

1. Harvest names who have taken the proficiency examinations
2. Send reminder from Pat – Needs to be sent by when (give Pat the names and can reiterate critical deadlines)
3. Sort FAQs for responses from JT versus Aran (by the next conference call)
4. Begin working on a flow chart (test security conference call with Anchorage)
5. Next call is April 11, 2006 at 11:30 (PST) or 10:30 (AST)

Conference Call – April 11, 2006

Attendance: Jerry, Pat, Aran, Les

Current Training and Piloting

Review of training issues sent by Aran (see attached document)

JT will keep everyone updated when Josh completes the changes.

Dianna is completing an explanation of training of administration

Feedback on training progress (screen detail)

Aaron can redesign the feedback to teachers as they gain proficiency.

How are folks doing on proficiency Pat will run the numbers and send tomorrow.

Help desk is Pat as she trains Sevrina?

Clarifications on data entry sent to teachers by Pat

Modification isn't possible to enter presently; teachers note on hard copy.

Aaron needs to build this into the system

Spend more time on scoring and reporting

Focus group on May 11 (3:30-4:30 Alaska time)

Pat will send a protocol to structure the meeting with a warm up exercise and specific questions; she will use the emails as a source.

Training clarification: Is it possible for Qualified Trainer Mentors to train other Associate Qualified Trainers to help them train building level personnel?

DTCs (1 per district) train associates to help review the protocols and get people trained

What does a QT have to go through? See Test Security document.

Limit the number of QTs and receive approval from Aran

Collect more information from the current process (levels of accuracy on submitted materials, audio conference call, and email correspondences)

Who has access to the secure test materials?

Review of security (see attached document)

Can paraprofessionals (a) who are highly qualified or certified, AND (c) administer the assessment if they become a QA.

Paraprofessionals can help assist the QA also (cut flash cards, mark protocols) with supervision.

Need to finalize near the end of May-Bgn of June

Next year the materials will change – Add *Practice Test* and *Secure Test* on headers

Develop a form for teachers to sign

Pat and Aran will develop a policy via email

Future Training and Reporting

Training schedule in September (see attached document)

Have a room with 30 and need for 60 to train

Day 1 is train and Day 2 is to get proficient (while cohort 2 is being trained); Day 3 is cohort 2 gets proficient

Dates in September

6th is the launch Juneau

7th is Juneau training overview (4-6 hours)

8th is Fairbanks training (4-6 hours)

9th-15th is Anchorage (Boniface and BP) – Regional overview and training

Qualified trainer training at the BP Energy Center on October 31

For the general education standards based assessments, DRC (test vendor) posts the results on-line so the district test coordinators (DTC) can download the individual student reports and mail to parents with a guide to interpret the forms. Can we also do this?

Will add to FAQ.

FAQ (see attached document)

Will focus on this exclusively on April 18

Other

Conference Call – April 25, 2006

Attendance: Jerry, Pat, Aran, Les

Update on training and data collection for pilot

A low count of completers (6/14)

Proficiency site fixes needed

Data entry fixes: Task 4 in writing and passage reading

Fairbanks network is still a problem

Add Tasks 14 and 15 training in Ideas and Organization

Data entry problem ok now

SnapZ Pro software has been purchased and will be used to provide very specific training on various aspects of web navigation (e.g. print the screen) or learn how to score (e.g., Ideas and Content)

Decision – Extend the pilot to May 12 (Friday) for data entry and sending packets – Close the data entry site

Focus group is May 11 at 3:30 (ADT)

Sev will assume help desk functions and will need to use a checklist for double-checking on fixes made as well as take all the proficiencies and administer the test and enter the data.

Technical advisory committee

Need the TAC to help resolve the major issues in adapting the current assessment with the future assessment

Send the extended GLEs to reflect the item development to be conducted in the pilot and field-testing that is planned for 2006-07 and 2007-08

Items located with a common set of items that are being adapted to grade level standards

Need a document that orients them what to look for in the materials and a possibility of new materials in another packet

Pull some tasks in reading (letter reading and reading comprehension) and math (shapes and time) and writing (letter copying and story writing)

Need the white paper to help frame the issues of reduction of breadth and depth

Focus only on the tasks and the proficiency descriptors

Frequently asked questions

What to do with students who cannot take the AA: Need to collect data from the pilot (how many); also need to find out what we need to know about them (focus group and survey); finally, need to use Pat's work with CO to help develop some items that are more pre-symbolic tasks (using observations and structured collections of evidence)

Ask at the focus group: Who administered the survey?

Phase I – Complete the Black (EED) and Red (DRA) and then share with each other; Phase II – also harvest all the comments, focus group results, data analysis, help from Pat to prioritize for the next contract

Other?

Conference Call – May 9, 2006

Attendance: Aran, Pat, JT, Les

Last Minute Issues in Closing Down Pilot Testing

12 teachers submitted materials.

Data dump request to Aaron.

Teachers are to be told that on Friday night, data collection is being stopped-actual data dump begins on Monday.

Update from Pat and Aran on Focus Group

Protocol – Purpose is to debrief of pilot to know what changes to make for the operational assessment in the fall; unlikely to make substantive changes.

Problem with the most significant disabilities not being adequately served.

Survey helps us find this number to determine how many are there in the system.

Bought a test off the shelf-don't want a test that is too easy.

What did they think of the checklist – See Fran's feedback.

Focus on operational issues that can be changed by fall.

Training is not nightmarish but requires a computer lab and requires attention to high level of proficiency.

AYP (using survey) – Will they count? Need a valid score (even with a student that is so low as long as it is valid).

Does the training in the fall need to include this but not live in the focus (e.g., with an FAQ or a policy document)?

Top Three Issues – Need to send an email (separate from ending the pilot) and purpose to get the issues not the answers.

- Eligibility – What changes should be made?
- Scoring and reporting – What can be done to make the system more amenable to use?
- Most significant cognitive disabilities – How to improve the checklist?
- Test administration directions – Where should the clarification be placed?
- Other (is the logistics for mentors in dealing with the training) –

Review of Technical Advisory Committee

Only twice per year; need DRA live in these meeting (at least 1 of the 2 days).

Meeting dates set for fall (Oct. 25-26) and Spring.

Is advice consistent with DOE? Can the advice be financed?

Audio conference with Stanley to confirm.

Set proficiency descriptors under a grade range (versus a developmental IEP) with which they are aligned or linked.

Approval appeared related to specific content.

High expectations help teachers focus on appropriate content.

Fran – Ex can given without access to grade level content (but won't be focused on curriculum).

Making the assessment age appropriate is the focus (not grade level content) – even if the skill is very low.

Frequently Asked Questions

May need to meet in San Francisco at CCSSO to take the FAQ one next step.

Other?

Minutes from Conference Call – June 11, 2006

Attendance: Aran, Pat, JT

Missing 05-06 items

Participation guidelines
Training EED staff on code
Back up systems
Content and Bias Review
FAQ

Operational steps for next steps (page 2)

Numbered and dated tasks
Access to the training site for mentors to check on protégé
Observation checklist

Need to add Help desk
Need to add FAQ (for field: mentors and assessors)

Close out report of 2005-2006 (is page 2 included in close out?)
The report is part of the close out

Feedback from the pilot will be incorporated into the launch preparation
Two phases of change: (a) those that clarify the administration and scoring, and (b) substantive changes that are one year out. The report needs to highlight this distinction.

In the future, the report will be expected in July.
See Stacey and Aran for comments to incorporate immediate changes

Page 3

Will repopulate with cousin items
Web site training will be modified update from that used in the pilot
Task blue print is new task order
Student-classroom roster-district report (which report can be produced)
AK needs to dictate reporting for Aaron Glasgow to program (for 2006-2007)
DRC told AK how the report would look; Aran would edit
Needed data tape and specifications also to be added to the report
Need to add fields to the report (like proficiency)
Report development would proceed in two phases: (a) something immediate and (b) something for long term

Need to develop the pilot (new test development)
If the test is done in April (standard setting in April or May)-Needs to be done in time for AYP analysis

On line demo to give people the flavor of the training

Timelines for Next Year (including this summer – Page 4)

Help desk would be available from the training throughout the testing

AK needs to define the specifications for the mentor access

Testing window closes April 13: Need 2 weeks to dump the data

Standard setting is held the first week of April 30-May 4 or May 5/8-5/12: Includes 24 individuals

Statement of work done in May for discussions in June

Pat will revise the document and send to Aran, Les, and JT

Date	Source	Problem	Resolution
9-Mar	Missy Gordon	When I went into the alt. assess pilot site to do some training today I get server error messages for the Reading and Math tasks. It doesn't seem to be any of the other areas on the site. I talked to Rachel Galbraith to see if she was having the same problems and she did. I tried using Safari, Int Exp, and Firefox on the Mac and then switched to a Dell and tried Int Exp. I got the same error messages. This is pretty frustrating and knowing the special ed teachers in our district as I do, this would be beyond frustrating to many of them.	Josh Geller checked finding: Mac/Firefox: No error messages — all areas functioning as expected Mac/Safari: No error messages – all areas functioning as expected Mac/Opera: Minor, text characters out of place – a little slower to load pages but otherwise functioned fine Mac/Mozilla: No error messages — all areas functioning as expected Mac/Internet Explorer 5.2: No error messages — all areas functioning as expected
9-Mar	Rachel Korkoske	I am having difficulty accessing the training for writing and math. I can access the training for the reading, but I finished it yesterday. Is the server down?	Jerry responded: all should work. i just tried it from my home. the site is http://ak.k12test.com
9-Mar	Rachel Galbraith	One of our tech personnel came to help me today and we couldn't open either the writing or the math sessions of the training for the Alternate. We could open the writing however. He said that it was a difficulty on your end. If that could be corrected he will look at my inability to open the video sections of the training and proficiency.	Aaron Glasgow's response: i contacted the technology person with dra. here is his response. it works for me: the site is http://ak.k12test.com/ let me know what I can do.
9-Mar	Regina Feliciano	I am trying to get onto our testing site to finish up my testing. I can get into everything except Math and Writing . Is there a reason for this?	
10-Mar	Terri Robbins	I have finished the items in Math, Reading, and Writing. I noticed, though, that anytime I tried to get proficiency in a task that called for CWS or CLS , the first task was always rejected with a note that I had already tried that task (and I'd never even seen the task before). It was very frustrating and I began just entering any old thing and submitting it so that I could go on to the 2nd task and have my scores accepted. I also had trouble with the Quicktime movie in items 14 and 15 in the math section - scoring proficiency. It never came up. All I saw was the giant blue Q. I finally guessed the scores and managed to "gain proficiency" even though I never actually saw or heard the student perform. I was able to get all other quicktime movies.	
13-Mar	Missy Gordon	Rachel and I have been passing the various emails back and forth. Since you aren't having the problems we have, could it be our district's firewall or other security settings? It was weird. When Rachel couldn't access writing and math, I couldn't either . The next day I saw that the pages came up so I figured all was copacetic. Then I went into Reading Tasks to show someone in our office what the program was about and random pages of the reading tasks came up with the error messages. Not all the pages, just some. It was so strange. Just giving you more info to help try and trouble shoot this.	Josh Geller's response: Sorry you have been having trouble accessing the site. Thanks for the further detail. It could be district security/firewall related. Have you attempted to access the site from a non-district networked computer? Do you have district instructional technology (site administrator) to ask? It is puzzling, however, that you are able to view some but not all of the pages. Also, you might print out a couple pages with the error messages you are receiving and fax them to me (541-346-5689). The more specific we can get the easier it will be to figure out what's happening. Thank you for your patience. I apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused. Please keep me posted and I will help troubleshoot as best as I can.

15-Mar	Aaron Glasgow		<p>In response to the couple of emails we have received regarding slow (or so slow they don't play) quicktime movies in AK I have created several options for review. I'm not sure how you would like to proceed with this decision - ideally, we could get these tested by someone on the "other" end of the connection (in Alaska) before I make any serious changes to the site. Anyhow Math 14 Training seems to be the most common problem movie so here it is in three flavors:</p> <p>1) The original movie: http://dev.k12test.com/m14tqh0001_O.mov</p> <p>2) A "medium" compression movie. This is about 60% of the size of the one above. It is also better hinted and designed to be streamed: http://dev.k12test.com/m14tqh0001_M.mov</p> <p>3) A "heavy" compression version of the same. This movie is a little on the jerky side but only 1/3 the size or so: http://dev.k12test.com/m14tqh0001_L.mov,</p> <p>Jerry responded: I found the third option to be perfectly fine. I would rather have it work consistently even though overcompressed.</p> <p>Aaron responded: Sounds good... I've got a list of about 45 movies that are over 8MB and part of the training (there are some large scoring movies but (a) I have not seen any feedback saying they are a problem and (b) these movies often have close-up shots of student work and require extra clarity).</p>
17-Mar	Darilynn Caston	I am finishing up the proficiency part of the math and am not able to get Task 14 or 15's movie to pull up on the testing portion of the task. I have tried both safari and firefox and neither will pull up. Without that I am unable to take those two tests. Please let me know what you think.	
17-Mar	Aran Felix	this was a bit confusing: titles on the pages Reading Overview: Comprehend Printed Text Training: Comprehend Printed Text Learn to score: Comprehend Printed Text Test Scoring Proficiency: Comprehend ORAL AND Printed Text Although I hadn't done this task yet, because I completed Task 4 - Comprehend Oral Text, #12 already shows me as proficient . Is this correct?	Jerry's response: the reason that we considered them both proficient is that the first task is listening comprehension (task 4) and the second one is reading comprehension (task 12) but both have the same types and number of questions. we thought it would be redundant to require you to repeat the scoring (which remains the same). so yes, getting proficient on one counts for both.
17-Mar	Aran Felix	I'm working my way through the reading modules. I lost sound Segment Phonemes . Pulled my headset off, listened to it directly from computer, plugged back in and got nothing. Went to next module, Identify letter sounds, I can hear a very muffled voice straight off computer and nothing with headset. I logged off and in again a couple times, to try to refresh it. So...something is wrong with my sound apparently.	The problem was in my docking station!! Undocked, checked the computer, redocked - everything is fine again. Sorry for the much ado about nothing. Thought maybe it was server traffic.
20-Mar	Aran Felix	There is nothing in the training about scoring ideas and organization , only CWS. The program does not allow me to submit without filling in all the blanks. This will be an issue for the teachers. I checked around in the manual and did not find any other explanation.. Can you explain?	
21-Mar	Aran Felix	Training module and instructions say to show present the flashcards in random order and say Here are many different numbers. Also are to have the number line out. The video clip does not show flashcards or numbers, only the number line, and the assessor points to the numbers on the number line and says Here are many different numbers.	Jerry's response: I think it might be as simple as the flash cards may not be needed (as in the video) and the print directions should make them optional (for the first item). The flash card is really only for the first item in task 9 and not for all the others.

21-Mar	Aran Felix	One of the questions is repeated ; is this supposed to happen? How many cubes stacked on top of each other will be as tall as the girl?	
23-Mar	Stacy Street	When I pull up the pilot Alternate Assessment on the web site it still says Oregon on the cover page ...is this the test we want in regards to the pilot Alternate Assessment for Alaska?	Jerry's response: perhaps you are in the wrong site as I don't see any reference to Oregon. Send me the url you are using. Problem was solved, wrong url.
23-Mar	Aran Felix	I resolved that video issue. I went back to 14/15 to see if I was doing something wrong. If I wait on the page for awhile, eventually a different looking screen appears, called Item 1. I removed that concern from my issues list. I think I was being too hasty, and this particular video takes longer to load and appear than the others. Maybe it was simply the time of day? heavy internet traffic perhaps?	
27-Mar	Darilynn Caston	In the pilot section where we add a student and the student information (pulldown) there is no 8th grade to select . Could they please add that so I can select it for the student.	
30-Mar	Stacy Street	I have just printed up the Training and Proficiency Program Manual January 2006 for Extended R/W/M Assessment off the test web site. It is for the AK Dept. of Ed. buttttttt where do I get the actual testing materials/pages to print up to use when administering the pilot? This manual I just printed up is where I score the student responses as I am giving the pilot, correct....	Jerry's response: you appear to NOT read the directions and then send us emails about problems that do not exist. PLEASE PAY ATTENTION. READ ALL MATERIALS. for example: you went back to a website we used in testing in December; THIS IS NOT THE WEB SITE WE TOLD YOU TO LOG INTO DURING THE TRAINING! Aran Felix's response: I am trying to secure a computer lab for a whole day following the training next fall. I think it would be very helpful to complete the training, then sit at the computer and roll through all the proficiency modules without the distractions of the classroom, while still having the comraderie of other learners, plus trainers accessible for answering questions and getting us to think through some of the issues we run into while becoming proficient. Would that be helpful? (My only difficulty may be in securing sufficient lab space). In the meantime, as I worked through the modules, I kept a list of everything I encountered: Questions, things I'd like clarified, scoring protocols I felt could use more explaining--for example, I had to fail some of the scenarios a couple of times to infer a particular rule. we will have a focus group audio in May to review issues/successes. As you go through the process, please keep track of any issues/successes/helpful hints because we can train to this in the fall.
31-Mar	Missy Gordon	I hit send before I realized I neglected to say that the third example actually treats skipped numbers two different ways . The 50 is skipped and so the sequence has 2 marks against. 70 is skipped but only has 1 mark against it.	
31-Mar	Missy Gordon	I was watching the Count On Dictation scoring example. On the second example, 12 marks were made but supposedly there were only 8 possible. That means that a student could possibly get a negative score . That can't be right. I understand that if they don't say the correct next number they should get a - and if the sequence is correct then they get a ^. And, they can't get credit for a sequence that should have come before. However, it appears that the 2nd example is scored slightly differently from the 1st and 3rd. Any assistance in understanding this would be helpful.	

4-Apr	Missy Gordon	Just wanted to give you a heads up that we've been having problems loading the videos needed to finish the scoring proficiency. I hadn't cc'd you with the emails that I've sent regarding the problems. Josh Geller has reported that they are working on compacting those videos to make them easier to access. Rachel Galbraith was persistent in working on hers and ended up going to our public library where the videos would load a little faster. What I've experienced is it taking up to 30 minutes for the video to load and then when I take the test and go to put in my answers, the site logs me out due to lack of activity. Just giving you a heads up because this will be a HUGE problem next fall if it's not fixed.	Pat Almond's response: There will be a focus group to debrief the spring pilot on May 11th. I believe it will be a audio conference call and you should be getting information about it soon. I hope you can attend and let us know how things went.
4-Apr	Pat Almond	Aaron, Linda forgot her PASSWORD and tried clicking on the link "Forgot Password?" Something didn't work. Will you send her the password or assist her in getting reconnected. Thanks for any assistance you can give.	Aaron's response: Thanks Pat. Just for you guys to know. Here is the message we get (I tried it myself): Failed to connect socket: Address family not supported by protocol. The password for Linda Robertson is: XXXX
4-Apr	Missy Gordon	Okay, now I can't get logged on . I was able to log on last week but now it won't let me. Thanks. My log on user is mgordon@northstar.k12.ak.us and my password is GSDE3293	Aaron's response: It looks like your password is: XXXX. I'm guessing you used the "send password" feature and it partially worked - it changed your password on the system but did not send the email to you. Let me know if you have any additional problems
4-Apr	Missy Gordon		Hi there. I went ahead and ran the verify Systems Requirement just to see what would happen. It ran just fine. The video worked okay too, only took a few minutes to load. I do have our tech guy who knows the sped machines going to be working with me soon to just make sure that our network is set to run your site as a priority like we do the IEP program site.
7-Apr	Kris Selman	Math-Manipulate Math concepts count take away 1st (top) audio button doesn't work .	
7-Apr	Kris Selman	Just quick comment on the "time of day" assessment section of the Alaska Pilot. The pictures may not reflect an Alaska (especially northern bush Alaska) student's experience with daylight.	
10-Apr	Pat Almond		A pilot teacher said "I am not sure what data I am suppose to be entering into the Website." I thought others might ask. So below are directions for entering student data. If you already figured this out on your own, congratulations! Data Entry Directions: Go to the website http://ak.k12test.com/ Log in—with your USERNAME and PASSWORD ·From the list on the left, select "Scoring and Reporting" Move cursor over "Add Student(s)" and click Enter the requested student information: name, age, gender, etc. Click "Submit" After you click submit, you will see the student's name and with options to "enter data" for reading, writing, or mathematics (you should see the table below on the screen—you might need to scroll down) Select the test subject you want to enter Transfer your ratings from the "Scoring Protocol" onto the online data entry form. (These are the materials you downloaded from the "Secure Test" option on the main menu.) Follow these same steps for all subjects

11-Apr	Pat Almond		Q Is that the "Scoring and Reporting" link the data entry for the practice test? A No. You do not need to enter the practice data into the online data entry system. Q For our practice test, do we need to use our volunteer's real name and identification number or can we make it up? A No. You may record student initials or a made-up name on the practice scoring protocol. Q How are you differentiating between the two if we use normal identifying information for the practice kids? A We will refer to the scoring protocol. Please clearly mark both the practice student protocol and the pilot student protocol and return them both in the envelope provided. Q When entering the pilot data, where do we enter administration codes (e.g., Standard, Modified, Not Administered). A The administration codes cannot be entered into the online data entry. Please clearly mark those codes on the scoring protocol. We will add that information to the file after the pilot closes.
18-Apr	Margie Galsey	I just spent a good portion of my morning inputting data from the alternate assessment that I gave. I hit the submit button after the reading and the writing and went on to the math section. When I checked back to the reading and writing, the data was all gone. Does that me I need to input it again? I am actually not finished testing and will need to put more data in shortly.	
18-Apr	Missy Gordon	If a child is unable to pass any items on the alt assessment due to the severity of their disability and the Assistive Tech form is used, they will be considered as passing? or failing? And if it's failing, then their school will fail AYP every year? I had written down they passed but then I heard from someone else that they would fail. That's very disconcerting as schools will not want to have those students in their buildings if it will impact their AYP.	Pat Almond's response: Before opting out of the assessment: * Administer three items within the first task. If there is no response from the student on three consecutive items, stop that task and move to the next task. * Administer three items within the next task. If there is no response from the student on three consecutive items, stop that task and move to the next task. * Administer three items within the next task. If there is no response from the student on three consecutive items, stop that task and move to the next task. * If you have three task that meet this scenario, stop the testing for that subject and complete the survey. I don't have a complete set of the materials that you handed out at the training. The one question I have is, are there three surveys? One for each subject or one single survey? Under the one survey condition, the teacher would only need to give three tasks in one subject. If there are separate surveys for separate subjects then the teacher would need to give three tasks with three "no responses" in each for each subject. Aran Felix's response: We administer three items in Task 1 in reading to student, no response. Next, Administer three items in a second task in reading, no response Next, Administer three items in a third task in reading, no response Complete survey. Test administration complete.
19-Apr	Missy Gordon	I talked to another of our tech people this afternoon. He believes that our bandwidth is such that we will always have trouble downloading those videos . If they weren't a part of the page then he thought he might be able to put them on a server here for us to access. We are looking at making sure that the site is a priority one on the router but then everything is going web-based and so we are fighting against other sites that have many more users than the Alt Assess one. He's also going to talk to the network staff about us having a 2-3 week window in the fall in which we would be way up on the router list and the teachers would have that time to get their training done. Would that work out with the plan of implementation?	

19-Apr	Missy Gordon	<p>These are from the scoring proficiency trials or scoring training pages: Comprehension - Story</p> <p>The Surprise The question is something like "why is the boy slow going to the garage" and the answer listed has to do with making noise. The story itself doesn't mention any noise - just an open door - so if a child were to give an answer about noise then this is an inferential question versus a factual recall question. It seems like some questions get credit for inferential information and others do not. The question "What clues led Tim to go to the garage?" should not lead to an answer of "getting tired of homework." "Getting tired of homework" is not a clue and if you asked students about a clue, they might be thrown off.</p> <p>Phoneme - there are no examples of the elongated sounds that are in the test item. rrrrrr-aaaaaa-t It would be helpful to have examples of this type of thing.</p> <p>Blend Sounds - The student says r-a-a-r-a-t This is hesitating. Why did the student get any points?</p> <p>Read Sentences - It would be nice to have the reasoning behind giving full credit even if they add extra words. Teachers will want to know.</p> <p>ID Money - "buck" is allowed as an equivalent of dollar to get credit but "greenback" is not it is important to either explain why some slang is allowed OR to not allow any slang OR to allow slang</p> <p>Manipulate Math Concepts - (I have already sent this in once and heard from Josh but the last time I checked, it still was the same.) The video took 25 minutes to load with no other programs open and with the appropriate browsers, etc and the most current software. By the time it loaded, I couldn't put the info in because it logged me off.</p> <p>Number Sequencing - Count on Dictation (already expressed this to Josh) The video shows errors in scoring. It is important that it be explicit that they are counting carets. Right now, the directions make the "-" symbols seem more important than the carets and it will confuse some of our teachers who don't have a lot of experience scoring standardized tests.</p> <p>Computation Trial 1 - It said that the reversed 2 for 1+1 got 0 points. Then in 32 + 15 the 4 was reversed in 42 but got credit. If there is a reason, then it should be explained.</p> <p>Write your Name, Write a Sentence, and Write a Story - No Pictures. All of them said that I had previously failed Trial #1 when I had not done it before and the answers I did put in were correct.</p> <p>Write a Story w/Pictures Trial 1 - Girl is spelled gril in the student sample but is</p>	
--------	--------------	--	--

		<p>spelled correctly in the typed scored response so the scoring is off. It should be counted wrong but is counted correct.</p> <p>Administration Tasks - the descriptions to score are very hard to answer and why take the time to figure out what is meant when it doesn't matter what you answer?</p> <p>OTHER The Training and Proficiency manual we were given doesn't have the chart for Ideas and Organization points. So when you are doing the training you don't have that info. In the Training and Proficiency manual under CWS. The Practice Example 1 The student's version of, He started to eat them. Doesn't have a period at the end of them. If the period is counted as part of the word before it then there should be a "-" before the word "them" as well as after it instead of a ^. If that's not true then the reasoning behind it needs to be explained.</p>	
21-Apr	Pat Almond	<p>POSSIBLE PROBLEM ONE--DAATA ENTRY: I just logged into the system as Margie again today. Her data looked the same as they did on Tuesday at noon. Another teacher reported similar problems but was ultimately able to enter data. I want to get back to her by Monday and let her know if she should log in and try again to enter her data.</p> <p>POSSIBLE PROBLEM TWO--Individual Student Reports: I've only checked reading so far, but the headings on the student report do not match. From a quality control perspective, I think we should confirm that the calculations and the headings are both correct.</p>	<p>REQUEST ONE: 1. Would it be possible for me to get a download or a view of the raw data? Preferably in EXCEL format.</p> <p>2. Will you answer the following questions: *Did Margie's data entry get recorded? *If "yes," shouldn't we be able to see it on the screen? *How many students & teachers have test data entered to date?</p> <p>REQUEST TWO: Would you and Aaron confirm the accuracy of the calculations on all three reports (reading, writing, and mathematics)?</p>
21-Apr	Pat Almond	<p>I am trying to follow-up on the possible data entry problems reported by Stacey Street and Margie Falsey. I encountered the same problems that they reported. Below are my findings from this afternoon: reading data entry resulted in "Query failed" message (screen information displayed below) writing data entry resulted in "Query failed message (screen information displayed below) mathematics data entry resulted in "Query failed message (screen information displayed below) table on the data and reporting screen did not appear to reflect the data that I had entered (screen information displayed below) Is there any chance we can address this over the weekend and send out information to pilot teachers on Monday morning that explains the problem and that it has been resolved? Reading = screen that appeared after clicking the "SUBMIT" button (04/21/06, 4:00 p.m. PT) Query failed: error=1054 error=Unknown column 'admin' in 'field list' query=INSERT INTO ex_read (`ID`, teacher, Time_Stamp, XR1_1, XR1_2, XR1_3, XR1_4, XR1_5, XR1_6, XR1_7, XR1_8, XR2_1, XR2_2, XR2_3, XR2_4, XR2_5, XR2_6, XR2_7, XR2_8, XR3_1, XR3_2, XR3_3, XR3_4, XR3_5, XR3_6, XR3_7, XR3_8, XR4_1, XR4_2, XR4_3, XR4_4, XR4_5, XR4_6, XR5_1, XR5_2, XR5_3, XR5_4, XR5_5, XR5_6, XR5_7, XR5_8, XR6_1, XR6_2, XR6_3, XR6_4, XR6_5, XR6_6, XR6_7, XR6_8, XR7_1, XR7_2, XR7_3, XR7_4, XR7_5, XR7_6, XR7_7, XR7_8, XR8_1, XR8_2, XR8_3, XR8_4, XR8_5, XR8_6, XR8_7, XR8_8, XR9_1, XR9_2, XR9_3, XR9_4, XR9_5, XR9_6, XR9_7, XR9_8, admin, XR10_1, XR10_2, XR10_3, XR10_4, XR10_5, XR11e_CW, XR11e_ERR, XR11m_CW, XR11m_ERR,</p>	

		<p>XR11d_CW, XR11d_ERR, XR12e_1, XR12e_2, XR12e_3, XR12e_4, XR12e_5, XR12e_6, XR12d_1, XR12d_2, XR12d_3, XR12d_4, XR12d_5, XR12d_6)</p> <p>VALUES (29, 'Pat Almond--Please delete before analysis', '04/21/06', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '0', '0', '0', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '2', '1', '0', '1', '2', '0', '0', '1', '2', '3', '2', '1', '0', '0', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '0', '0', '1', '2', '3', '3', '2', '1', '2', '1', '2', '1', '2', '1', '0', '1', '2', '1', '2', '1', '0', '1', '2', '0', 'std', '2', '2', '2', '2', '2', '45', '5', '70', '10', '88', '30', '1', '2', '1', '0', '0', '1', '1', '0', '1', '2', '2', '1'); Writing – screen that appeared after clicking the “SUBMIT” button (04/21/06, 4:08 p.m. PT) Query failed: errorno=1054 error=Unknown column 'admin' in 'field list' query=INSERT INTO ex_write (`ID`, XW1_1, XW1_2, XW1_3, XW1_4, XW1_5, XW1_6, XW1_7, XW1_8, XW1_9, XW1_10, XW2_1, XW2_2, XW2_3, XW2_4, XW2_5, XW2_6, XW2_7, XW2_8, XW3_1, XW3_2, XW3_3, XW5_1, XW5_2, XW5_3, XW5_4, XW5_5, XW5_6, XW5_7, XW5_8, XW5_9, XW5_10, XW6_1, XW6_2, XW6_3, admin, XW7_1, XW7_2, XW7_3, XW7_4, XW7_5, XW7_6, XW7_7, XW7_8) VALUES (29, '0', '1', '2', '1', '0', '1', '2', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '2', '3', '4', '4', '3', '2', '4', '4', '2', '0', '1', '2', '3', '3', '2', '1', '0', '1', '2', '3', '3', '3', 'std', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '0'); - - - Mathematics – screen that appeared after clicking the “SUBMIT” button (04/21/06, 4:15 p.m. PT) Query failed: errorno=1054 error=Unknown column 'admin' in 'field list' query=INSERT INTO ex_math (`ID`, XM1_1, XM1_2, XM1_3, XM1_4, XM1_5, XM1_6, XM1_7, XM1_8, XM2_1, XM2_2, XM2_3, XM2_4, XM2_5, XM2_6, XM2_7, XM2_8, XM3_1, XM3_2, XM3_3, XM3_4, XM3_5, XM3_6, XM3_7, XM3_8, XM4_1, XM4_2, XM4_3, XM4_4, XM4_5, XM4_6, XM4_7, XM4_8, XM4_9, XM4_10, XM5_1, XM5_2, XM5_3, XM5_4, XM6_1, XM6_2, XM6_3, XM6_4, XM7_1, XM7_2, XM7_3, XM7_4, XM7_5, XM7_6, XM7_7, XM7_8, XM7_9, XM8_1, XM8_2, XM8_3, XM9_1, XM9_2, XM9_3, XM9_4, XM9_5, XM10_1, XM10_2, XM10_3, XM10_4, XM11_1, XM12_1, XM12_2, XM13_1, XM13_2, XM13_3, XM13_4, XM13_5, XM14_1, XM14_2, XM14_3, XM14_4, XM14_5, XM14_6, XM14_7, XM15_1, XM15_2, XM15_3, XM15_4, XM16_1, XM16_2, XM16_3, XM16_4, XM16_5, XM17_1, XM17_2, XM17_3, XM17_4, XM17_5, XM18_1, XM18_2, XM18_3, XM18_4, XM19_1, XM19_2, XM19_3, XM20_1, XM20_2, XM20_3, XM20_4, XM20_5, XM20_6, XM20_7, XM20_8, XM20_9, XM20_10, XM20_11, XM20_12, XM20_13, XM20_14, XM20_15, XM20_16, XM20_17, XM20_18, XM20_19, XM20_20, XM21_1, XM21_2, XM21_3, XM21_4, XM21_5, XM21_6, XM21_7, XM21_8, XM21_9, XM21_10, XM21_11, XM21_12, XM21_13, XM21_14, XM21_15, XM21_16, XM21_17, XM21_18, XM21_19, XM21_20, admin, XM22_1, XM22_2, XM22_3, XM22_4, XM22_5, XM22_6, XM22_7, XM22_8, XM22_9, XM22_10, XM22_11, XM22_12) VALUES (29, '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '2', '0', '1', '2', '1', '0', '0', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '3', '2', '1', '0', '1', '2', '2', '3', '2', '1', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '2', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '2', '1', '1', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '2', '1', '1', '1', '0', '1', '0', '5', '2', '5', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '0', '0', '0', '0', '0', '0', '0', '0', '1', '0', '1', '0', '1', '1', '1', '1', '1', '0', '0', '0', '0', '0', '0', '0', 'std', '1', '0', '1', '2', '1', '0', '1', '1', '1', '2', '1', '0');</p>	
--	--	---	--

25-Apr	Brian Gong	I think it would be helpful to add a sample task or two, one in reading and one in math, along with scoring rubrics, so the TAC members have a sense of the types of tasks.	Pat Almond's suggestions April 25: Pat identified a couple of tasks in reading (letter naming and reading comprehension) and mathematics (identify shapes and tell time or calendar). Aran was pulling those from the AK Alt. Asmt. Secure Materials to provide as examples for the TAC.
25-Apr	Brian Gong	<p>The specifications appear to be for a single set of tasks. It would be helpful to have a document describing scoring and scaling for the set of tasks (if any--is the total score a number correct, weighted, etc.). It would also be helpful to have a document describing whether there will be multiple sets of items (i.e., an item bank) or multiple forms over years, and if so whether there will be formal equating or other measures taken to promote comparability of forms across years.</p> <p>Very importantly, it would be helpful to have a discussion of to which GLEs the items are being aligned and why (at least half the skills look below grade level 3 to me); particularly whether different sets of items will be developed for each Grade's GLEs. That is, we need more rationale about this part of the design before the TAC can comment on the alignment strategy.</p> <p>4. On the TAC Agenda, I misspelled a name--it should be "Jerry Tindal" rather than "Gerry."</p>	<p>Pat Almond's suggestions April 25: Pat's first pass at these questions. Jerry will address these topics during the presentation/discussion on May 3, 2006. The tasks perform somewhat like testlets. The items within tasks and the tasks within forms differ from form to form (typically year to year) so that any given form may have some items in common with another form but also some unique forms. Item difficulty levels are calculated when a sufficient number of responses is available. At this time, items are not weighted. Tasks are scored as percent correct based on total points earned. Some items are scored as correct/incorrect and some are scored as correct/incorrect/partially correct. Until now, the items within tasks have been unique by year so that the current year's form becomes a released test when the testing window ends. It then becomes available for use as a sample test for teachers and parents to use for practice with students. The Extended GLEs are new this year and the process of documenting alignment and developing items and/or tasks for ExGLEs that are not represented is a task for the coming year. There is currently an online discussion through the ASES about how states the number of standards, the breadth, and the depth of the standards represented. Current test specifications are not explicit about this issue and it is an issue that many states are addressing at this time. The white paper developed by the Tindal et. al. provided a description of alternate achievement standards (see below). There are few examples that are operational in states with the rationale requested explicitly documented for performance task/event assessments. In addition to the extended assessments being used in Alaska and Oregon, we know of three other approaches that are similar these include Naomi Zigmond's work in Pennsylvania, Sue Bechard's work with the Alternate Assessment Collaborative, and Steve Ferrara's work at AIR with South Carolina. These three approaches employ performance tasks or events for alternate assessments to be judged against alternate achievement standards. Each has "extensively prioritized" the general curriculum while maintaining high expectations for progress. There are two criteria being applied in states: Approval through the NCLB Peer Review Process and Review.</p>
27-Apr	Jill Besse	<p>1. I goofed and opened the writing section on one student, (Harlow), who I didn't test in writing and input the other student's, (Mielke), data. Is there a way to delete it so it doesn't score incorrectly???</p> <p>2. On the student I did administer writing too, I am unable to find the last 3 sections of the test on the computer score sheet to enter sections 8, 9 and 10. What am I doing wrong, please?</p> <p>3. Just information. I was unable to see the videos for training sessions 14 and 15 of the math so I was unable to complete those trainings. They just never opened--only had a picture of the big Q for Quick Time. I think I figured it out from the book though. Anyway, other than these glitches, I am finished and ready to mail the protocols. It was not difficult to give-- I liked it a lot better than the portfolios</p>	<p>Pat Almonds suggestions April 28: Thank you for your efforts. We are learning a lot from the pilot thanks to the detailed feedback from pilot participants like yourself. Here are some answers to your questions:</p> <p>1.Thanks for letting us know about the misplaced data for Harlow. We will make a note of this and delete the inappropriate data in the data file.</p> <p>2.You are correct about writing. Three tasks are missing from the data entry screen. Because this is a pilot, we will be entering all of the protocols by hand to verify the accuracy of the data entry system. We will capture the three tasks you were not able to enter at that time.</p> <p>3.You made a good decision in going on without lessons 14 & 15. For 2006-2007, the "real" assessment, we will be reducing the size of the videos so that they download without the size limitations. Thanks for finding a "work around" and completing the pilot.</p>

			Good thinking! Also, we agree that the pilot was confusing because there were multiple contacts. During the 2006-2007 year we hope to have a single point of contact for everything so that you will not need to figure out who to contact for what.
27-Apr	Missy Gordon	The 4's need to be the open top kind. Unless we are testing for their ability to differentiate various font or type styles, the print should approximate the print they would normally use. I went out earlier this week to try the math with a student and because she already has vision and fine motor issues, the 4 was beyond her. If I made an open top 4 and said, "make it this way" she could do it. This is also important if the child uses Touch Math techniques.	
30-Apr	Nan Koentopp	I am trying to input my data for the Alaska AA Pilot and when I try to input my writing data for tasks 8, 9, and 10 there is no where to input data . The data form on the computer screen stops after question 7 and has a "submit" button there. What do I do to provide data on those three tasks? Please advise.?	
1-May	Nan Koentopp	I also noticed on some of the reading tasks that the flash cards for the symbol recognition are different than the correct response written in the protocol . Has anyone brought that to your attention? How do you suggest I move forward with that particular task in the reading? I will most likely complete the testing today and send it out as well. (symbol recognition are different than the correct response written in the protocol. Has anyone brought that to your attention?	
1-May	Nan Koentopp	1) Reading Task 2: Identifying Signs and Symbols? I was not provided flash cards for fire alarm and wrong way, but was given silverware sign (I assume restaurant or food) and an "I" sign (I assume information). 2) Reading Task 10: Read Sentences? Instead of "Don't yell." I was given a sentence strip that said "Don't Trip." Instead of "He made a cake." I was given a sentence strip that said, "He made a meal." Instead of "Cars drive on the road." I was given a sentence strip that said, "Jim drove on the road." 3) Extended Reading Task 12: Comprehend Printed Text Level 1? The text on the protocol does not match exactly to the student reading . For example, in the middle of the paragraph on the scoring sheet it says "She could see Bob running this way and that." and then on the student text it states "She could see Bob running all over the place."	
2-May	Fran Maiuri	C: MOST SIGNIFICANT COGNITIVE DISABILITIES: Recommend changing the name of the survey to Assistive Technology and Communication Survey. The word Needs sounds like it might be to find out what teachers think is needed rather than what's actually being used. Directions are to mark what the student uses, which is the way it should be. G: TEST ADMINISTRATION DIRECTIONS: The Test administration section in the online training is very confusing. Is there a plan to fix that? I think the skills learned are important but the examples are not clear. Also, clarifying accommodations and modifications and their effect on scoring would be good. Would a student taking a modified test still be counted as participating? For a	

		<p>future conversation. Could there be approved modifications for those students with the most severe disabilities (kind of like our modified HSGQE)? Or perhaps eventually (sometime in the future) this is a second alternate assessment (more individualized, still functionally reading and writing and math for students at a pre-symbolic cognitive level, without the cognitive ability to pass items on the current test. E.g. Reading the story through switch access; site reading words, pictures or objects that are meaningful to the student, etc.).</p> <p>H: AYP CLARIFICATION: I may be one of the teachers who raised the question about how the new AA will be counted toward AYP, particularly for the students who have the most severe disabilities. We are already being asked how it affects schools if students with the most significant disabilities are clustered in schools and they can't access this test due to their disability. There are two parts to AYP. Can they still be counted as participating if they couldn't do any items on the test? Also, is it a valid test for these students, if as a result of their disability they can't access any of the items? As a result of their disabilities they have no possibility of being proficient in even one area in spite of receiving even the best instruction, so what are we measuring? I also think clarifying for teachers during training the draft nature of the proficiency descriptors and that they won't automatically see proficiency scores when they complete the scoring and why would be good.</p> <p>K: OTHER: A discussion of what training will really look like. How long is it taking? How many teachers need feedback or 'remedial' training after doing their 'test' student? Does it work to do the online all in one day or is that overwhelming? How much help do folks seem to need as they go through the online training? What areas give folks trouble? We're considering designing some part of our face to face training to help teachers understand typical problem areas. ASD needs to train 80 teachers. We haven't decided yet whether we'll train any paraprofessionals. We see the time periods that exist this year as minimum to train all the folks we have. This is mainly due to the steps required before mentors are qualified trainers and allowing time for remediation before March 1 as needed. If when a teacher assesses their "test student" they are not proficient in one or more scoring areas, do they just need to re-give that section to the same or another student to become a qualified assessor? Can IEP teams choose alternate assessment any time during the school year or does the Dec. 15 date to change to alternate still hold? If they can choose alternate at any time, there could be challenges to getting teachers certified as qualified assessors in time for the assessment.</p>	
2-May	Elizabeth Galloway	When I was entering scores for writing it only went through task 7. Where do I put the rest of the scores? Task 8-10 ?	

10-May	Stacy Street	<p>Training – no concerns except with the scoring of the administrative video sessions where we viewed a tester testing a student and then we were to score the tester. The scores they gave individual items at times did not seem appropriate and did not seem evident in the video. This was noted by many of us though at our training with Gerry Tindal in Anchorage.</p> <p>Pilot Administrations – no concerns with participating students, administration directions and student materials and scoring protocols. In regards to the remaining items, I have concerns with a test that cannot be used by all eligible students to some degree. This test as presented is way too difficult for those students who are at the lower end of the severe needs population. If this test was scored based upon the amount of assistance/prompting needed instead of a flat Correct or Incorrect then it could be useable with all. For example in Colorado, all eligible students were given the same test items but scored on whether they completed the task independently, with verbal assistance, or physical assistance (modeling, partial to full physical assistance). I do not feel that providing a modified test that does not test the actual test items for these students is appropriate, especially for a score of 0, given the extra time a teacher may need to modify the task item and the time spent on it by the student. I do not see the point of the Assistive Technology Needs and Communication Systems checklist. Is this suppose to serve as the alternate to the alternate? If it is, it seems pretty minimal. Maybe once I see a completed scoring profile I will see a clearer picture of this whole process.</p> <p>Online System – no concerns except for data entry. I had no problems entering the scores for Reading and Math but did with Writing. The score sheet allowed me to enter the scores but would not allow me to submit them (kept saying, “Query Failed....”). After the third try it did finally accept the data. Also, the task items only went up to #7. #4 was missing, and there was no 8, 9, 10. I brought this to Patricia’s attention and she was able to add #4 and when I reentered the scores, they submitted on the first try. There still was no 8, 9, 10 available on the score sheet.</p>	
11-May	Jill Rampony, conference call	<p>It would have been nice to have 2 days to do training. I have a concern when we are training our teachers, if we just do a 1 day training and send them off, this is a lot of time to be putting in. Try to connect it up with type of credit as an incentive. Then it could be done on a Sat. also.</p> <p>On the proficiency exam, I really had a couple I disagreed with the answer. I don’t know if anyone else found that. There were a couple where the administrator was clearly giving the answers and then erasing the answers for the student. When taking the test it was said that was appropriate, don’t know if that’s right.</p>	
11-May	Pat Almond, conference call	A couple things I’m hearing on improvement, be clear on what works and doesn’t work on software that needs to be loaded, no dial up, compress the videos.	
11-May	Freeman, conference call	I experienced same thing, don’t know if I didn’t understand questions. I also disagreed with several scores the first time. Talking about the RWM	
11-May	Chris, conference call	Admin . I really struggled with, wasn’t really able to figure out criteria for appropriate and not appropriate.	

11-May	Rachel, conference call	I was frustrated downloading videos . Ended up having to go to public library because our band wasn't wide enough. Don't know if anyone else had same problem	
11-May	Regina, conference call	I had some problem with videos - took a long time. Admin. Saying something was appropriate when it wasn't, I'm sure was the same concern others are referring to	
11-May	Beth, conference call	I'm wondering if there's any way you can put it on a CD or set of CDs. Eliminate internet connections completely, then just have to score it some other way. Kind of be on an honor system.	
11-May	Rebecca, conference call	I know some districts are using pod cast . Videos may be put on pod cast type format, but it would still require internet.	
11-May	Jerry Tindal, conference call		What we will be doing is compressing the video files , will help solve the big problems. The admin. We've got consistent feedback something is scored wrong. Any other comments you have mark it up and send it as an e-mail and we'll try to solve it.
11-May	Linda, conference call	I gave test to high functioning student , concerned about modifications. Almost that the practice tests were overkill. And only concern was there was confusion on my part and Missy who gave it here, where we put the scores in, not the actual score itself, some pages were one way, some the other ways.	
11-May	Rebecca, conference call	Worried about lower functioning kids , seems like there should be something more then checklist to accommodate for those students	
11-May	Donna, conference call	I did 2.5 kids. One low functioning, one higher. Lower functioning would like to have lists that if this happens, try this, of accom/mod that I could try. He did like it, and he poured a lot of 0's, but I kept thinking what else can I do? Qs on how to score different kinds of disabled kids .	
11-May	Terry, conference call	One of the things for students required to take test, we're not supposed to provide accommodations if they're not using in classroom. Wondering if that's not valid for kids on this alternate assess too. Do we really want to see what their skills are at this time, and later on could come up with accommodations that would help them perform better, I could be wrong.	
11-May	Terry, conference call	Concern then that we take care of some of glitches with video and online training . Felt frustrated at times because admin proficiency I was giving + and - and finally just clicking on any old thing to get through it because I had no idea what would be right or wrong.	
11-May	Rachel, conference call	I had tremendous programs problems, but navigation not a problem. Qs: concerned about time component in math . None of things are timed, when I started this child took so much time to get started didn't have enough time to do test.	
11-May	Jerry Tindal, conference call	In response to Rachel's concern	Explains timed and then use different colored pencil. Can fix directions but basically asked to switch pencils so can tell how much kid finished in one minute, then let kid keep going. Shows automation.

14-May	Terri Robbins	<p>I had problems with the writing tasks. I found, for my student, there were issues beyond reversals, i.e. Size, distortion and placement of letters. In "real" life, if we want him to copy words or letters, we have him use the Pixwriter Program or his Dynavox (communication device). Because of his fine motor issues, we rarely have him "write." So, if the purpose of the task is to see whether he can represent/copy letters he sees, he should be able to use his devices,</p> <p>I think. If the task is fine motor control, I would ask why he is being asked to demonstrate a skill that general ed students are not.</p> <p>Also, he is left-handed and so his hand covered the letter he was supposed to copy as he began to copy it. I made another copy of the sheet and folded it so he could only see the letter and laid it on the other side of his paper. A left-hand form might be helpful.</p> <p>I noticed that the order of the coins on the flashcard was the order they are asked. Some students automatically go from left to right if they don't know the answer so they would score very high without even knowing the answers. This experience was, overall, a very positive one for me and, more important, for my student. Thanks for all the hard work.</p>	
19-May	Selman Kris	<p>A question came up re the training of teachers next year to administer the Alternate Assessment. What do we do if a teacher is not able to become a Qualified Assessor even after remediation?</p>	<p>Pat Almonds suggestions May 26: ALTERNATE QUALIFICATION I agree with your thinking. The one exception might be as follows: *the teacher can make the correct judgments in "real life" but NOT online If the qualified trainer (QT) conducts a performance evaluation, e.g. observes an administration with a "real" student and acts a 2nd rater by "back scoring" the student performances on XR XM & XW and verifies the teacher's qualification in test administration and scoring *And then the qualified trainer "qualifies" (certifies) the teacher/assessors qualification a signed QA (qualified assessor) certificate and a note of endorsement documenting the "hands on" observation HOW TO I wouldn't write this into policy but would include it as an exception in the "training of trainers" training. It would provide an alternative for a teacher who needs an alternate evaluation to the online qualifying evaluation--in my mind, the administration of extended assessment is a one-on-one administration between a teacher and a student with significant cognitive disabilities--the real qualification is not how the teacher performs with videos online over the world wide web but how the teacher performs with student materials and scoring protocols in an administration condition</p> <p>HOW OFTEN WOULD THIS OCCUR that said, I would think this circumstance would be needed for approximately 1% of the qualified assessors and it would require the qualified trainer to "qualify" the "assessor" through personal face-to-face evaluation</p> <p>RATIONALE We are using "online" training and evaluation to streamline and expedite training in the face of distance, travel costs, and time associated with more traditional classroom based training models--to me the actual "qualifying" involves professional judgment by a qualified trainer (QT)</p>

1-Jun	Issues during proficiency modules_Aran	Reading, 12-Comprehend Printed Text (CPT): Page title changes - Reading Overview: CPT Training: CPT Learn to Score: CPT Scoring Proficiency: CPT and Comprehend ORAL Text	First task is listening comprehension (Task 4) and the second one is reading comprehension (task 12). Both have the same types and numbers of questions. Achieve scoring proficiency on both to avoid redundancy.
1-Jun	Issues during proficiency modules_Aran	Writing, 9-Write a Story With Pictures: Cannot complete the scoring proficiency because must fill out Scoring Ideas and Organization boxes. Administration of test and training on scoring does not address Ideas/Organization	
1-Jun	Issues during proficiency modules_Aran	Math, 6-Measurement Concepts: One of the questions is repeated . Is this supposed to happen? Repeated question is: How many cubes stacked on top of each other will be as tall as the girl?	
1-Jun	Issues during proficiency modules_Aran	Math, 9-Number line: Training module and instructions say to show/present the flashcards in random order, and say: Here are many different numbers. Also, place the number line out. The video clip does not show flashcards of numbers. Only the number line is present. The assessor points to the numbers on the number line and says "here are many different numbers." Example and instructions do not match .	
1-Jun	Issues during proficiency modules_Aran	Math, 14 Manipulate Math Concepts: The first sound bite top of the page, Training has no sound . Add a note to teachers to take the task 15 training before completing this proficiency module, since Task 14 Count/Take Away and Task 15 Quantity are combined for proficiency. Test Scoring Proficiency – At first I thought the video was missing. It loaded VERY SLOWLY. Need to alert teachers that this may happen. Also, they need a scoring sheet to score this exercise as the material is presented in a different format than the other scoring proficiency modules.	
1-Jun	Issues during proficiency modules_Aran	Math, 15-Manipulate Math Concepts Quantity: The first sound bite top of the page, Training has no sound . Test Scoring Proficiency – At first I thought the video was missing. It loaded VERY SLOWLY. Need to alert teachers that this may happen. Also, they need a scoring sheet to score this exercise as the material is presented in a different format than the other scoring proficiency modules.	
1-Jun	Issues during proficiency modules_Aran	Math, 17-Counts Money: The student identifying units at least once and obtaining an extra 1 point is unclear . Every time they identify the units they get another point, or once in the whole set of exercise? Cannot add this in during proficiency exam – get a wrong answer. Also – partial addition not always clear – how does Quarter/Dime/Penny = 36cents, student responses with 30 cents, what did they add? Quarter + nickel but no nickel given. Random rules about partial adding: Dime/Penny/penny=12 cents. Students says 7cents	
1-Jun	Issues during proficiency modules_Aran	Math, 19 – Count on Dictation: On first training page received Error Message : The data that the plug-in requested did not download successfully. No sound on the first audio track, no track button on the second audio track. The video worked just fine.	
1-Jun	Issues during proficiency modules_Aran	Math, 19-Count on Dictation: Need scoring protocol on what to do if the student repeats the starter numbers ...do we count all as wrong? Or do we treat as if student started counting as the assessor prompt ended? I'm determining from my failures that its okay for the student to repeat the sequence, but apparently they receive one point less than they would have if they started as the prompt ended. This is a very confusing detail, and I'll probably take test after test to derive a	

		scoring protocol.	
1-Jun	Issues during proficiency modules_Aran	<p>Add the word Subtraction in the verbal instructions: "This is a timed task. There are some addition (subtraction) problems on this worksheet. Need to correct wording on the Note: Note:</p> <p>You may want to give the student a colored pencil to take the one-minute timed test and then have them change to another color of pencil to finish working the remaining problems. When the protocol is scored, the first colored pencil problems are scored for rate and all the problems are scored for accuracy.</p> <p>When the assessor gives the second set of problems she says: Multiplication – They are supposed to be Subtraction problems</p>	
1-Jun	Issues during proficiency modules_Aran	Math, 20-21-Timed Computation-Add/Subtr Facts: No instruction about inverted letters . The only mention in training is about “appropriately formed letters” which I took to mean not inverted. Earlier inverted numbers rec’d partial credit. Be good to teach this since this is a change from earlier scoring. The scoring proficiency test included word problems. This is the name of task 22, so I scored them without training. They were obviously not difficult, but there is no motivation	
1-Jun	Issues during proficiency modules_Aran	Math, 22- Mixed Computation : Recommend Task 22 be called Mixed Computation/Story Problems	
1-Jun	Issues during proficiency modules_Aran	ADMIN, All: All the Administration modules need to be pulled down because they appear to have all incorrect answers – seem to be reversed. We discussed this issue during training. Recommend an Not Applicable column for the things that don’t apply, or have a scoring protocol that says to put NA responses in the Appropriate column	
5-Jun	Feedback/Notes on priorities for what needs to be modified for 2006-2007		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reading Scoring Protocols and Student Materials, 2. Writing Scoring Protocols and Student Materials, 3. Mathematics Scoring Protocols and Student Materials, 4. Administration Manual, 5. Training Program for training Qualified Assessors (2006-2007 start up year): Presentation, Handouts, Activities, etc., 6. Training program for Qualified Trainers: Presentation, Handouts, Activities, etc., 7. AK AA Web Site Operations, 8. Online Training Program, 9. Online Proficiency Evaluation Program, 10. Online Materials Download Site, 11. Online Registration and Maintenance of information about qualified assessors (should this be managed by the trainers since they determine who is qualified?), 12. Online Data-Entry and Individual Student Report System.

May 19	Pat Almond		<p>Suggestion: During the pilot we are amassing tons of information and feedback. It is scattered throughout the DRA/AK pilot team (Jerry, Aran, Pat, Josh, Aaron, Sevrina, Meghan, etc.) We need to compile and classify the feedback by category (online training, online data entry, standard administration directions, content review, etc.) and then prioritize within categories. I recommend that we do something like the following:</p> <p>Develop an archive that brings the feedback together (maybe Sevrina could help with this) Group feedback by category (Josh would be excellent at this) Schedule a debriefing of the pilot with members of the DRA/AK pilot team (probably an audio conference call with key players) Schedule a follow-up once we have all of the information categorized with some priorities--to look at the coming year, the budget, and feasibility of making changes for the 2006-2007 operational assessment (my guess is that we won't be able to do everything. What would a systematic approach look like? A response to the type of comments in the email below might be to do the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. collect together all of the "content" feedback 2. schedule a content panel review of items/tasks for content and links to standards (do this in addition to a bias review) 3. revise some tasks/items, eliminate some, etc. Rather than take each component of content feedback and address it as it comes in, we should have these addressed periodically (annually) prior to developing the test forms for the operational assessment.
-----------	------------	--	--